The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI. ST. LOUIS, MO., MAY 26, 1904. NO. 21.

A PARADOX OF THE SPIRITUAL LIFE.

In striving after happiness we soon find that the shortest and quickest way to it is by renunciation and self-sacrifice. Yet the idea of living to gain happiness is in itself a selfish one. In fact, happiness is the conscious or unconscious end for which everyone lives, be he good or bad, be his end Heaven or earth. Therefore to practice self-denial in order to attain happiness, would seem to be but another and more refined form of selfishness. The sensualist may say to the spiritual man, "After all there is not much to choose between us. We are both living for the same thing; we are both in search of happiness. You are seeking it in your way, and I in mine, and we are consequently both of us equally selfish."

This is one of the paradoxes of which the Christian life is full. Father Maturin, in his preface to 'A Short Cut to Happiness,'*) shows up the underlying fallacy as follows:

In the first place, experience shows us that, whatever the reason, the spiritual man, as he becomes more spiritual, becomes more unselfish—his self-sacrifices produce the effect of destroying in him every form of self-love and self-seeking, every remnant of self-consciousness, every thought of self. His life is stamped with the most unmistakable evidences that he is ever considering others rather than himself, and that he can not be moved by anything that appeals merely to self-interest. Yet he will grant you that, at the same time, his whole life is controlled by what appears to be the subtlest form of self-interest—the desire for happiness. Moreover, he will assert, and no one will deny, that he has found it—a happiness that wells up within him independent of all cir-

*) A Short Cut to Happiness. By the Author of 'The Catholic Church From Within.' With a Preface by Rev. B. W. Maturin. St. Louis, B. Herder. 1904. Price 75 cts. (Preface, pp. 5—9.)

cumstances, and only faintly clouded by all life's sorrows and sufferings. Therefore, whatever the mere theorist may say, we must be guided by facts; and the facts of life speak loudly, clearly, persistently, and tell us that the spiritual man, though guided by precisely the same principles as the sensualist or the man of the world, in reaching his end has overcome, forgotten, got rid of self.

On the other hand, no one can deny that those who seek for happiness in the enjoyment of the senses or of the things of this life, become more and more self-centered, till pleasure or self-interest become the measure of all they do and all they seek.

But, secondly, the reason of this is evident: the Catholic faith does not teach us that there is any special merit in the mere act of renunciation; that it is better to be without a thing than to have it; that a man is any the better from the mere fact of giving up money or pleasure or enjoyment. Still less does it teach that the pain necessarily involved in sacrifice is in itself either good or pleasing to God. God forbid. Who that believes in the God of love, could believe that he takes pleasure in the mere fact of seeing his creatures suffer? But what the Catholic faith does teach us is, that all life is made up of a choice between higher and lower things; and that it is to live a life in accordance with reason to give up lower things for higher, the less valuable for the more valuable; and in accordance with faith to give up everything that holds us back for God. And the spiritual man is inspired by one motive in all his acts of renunciation, and that is the love of God. He begins, no doubt, with little knowledge of how that love will lay hold of him and rule him. He begins, if you will, by the realizing that it is only according to reason that he should give up small things for greater; but these acts open a door to him through which he sees things greater than he ever dreamed of and through which, at last, he gets glimpses of the love of God. Then the desire for that love kindles into a motive before which every other motive grows faint and dies. And, as it grows, the demands for sacrifice become more insistent. Where are they to stop? Like the incoming tide, this love swamps everything and bears down everything that would resist it. "I do count all things but dung that I may win Christ," cried one who felt the power of this love seize him in its mighty grasp. And this it is which destroys every lingering remnant of selfishness in the spiritual man.

Yes, he begins by the search for happiness, but he does not go far before he finds that it can only be found in the love of God. Then the desire for happiness becomes melted and fused in the fire which love kindles. He knows that happiness and the love of God are one and the selfsame thing, and in the love of God all

thought of self, even of his own happiness, is lost. The end and the means blend in one. The lover loses himself in the object of his love.

Thus it is only a very small part of the truth to say that the spiritual man and the earthly man are ruled by the same motive and in search of the same thing.

THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS AND THEIR RITUAL.

There was a time when our friends the "Knights of Columbus" put forth their ritual as their principal *raison d'être*. Recent criticisms seem to have impressed at least some of them with the idea that this was a mistake. The *New Century*, of Washington, which has always been one of their most zealous champions, in the course of an editorial called forth by the presentation of the fifty thousand dollar endowment fund to the Catholic University, says that "if the Knights of Columbus have suffered from ignorant fault-finders, they have suffered equally from narrow-minded supporters." .... "The *New Century* has at times bitterly regretted that too great an insistance seems to have been laid upon means, with a consequent disregard of the splendid ends that the order has set for itself. Degrees are necessary in an organization of this type [?]. They stimulate interest; they arouse tumultuous enthusiasm; they are effective and salutary [?]. But they are not everything. And to think that they represent absolutely the best is to confuse means with ends."*) Upon which utterance the Milwaukee *Catholic Citizen*, also an enthusiastic defender of the K. of C., comments as follows:

"While it would not be right to refer to the ritual features which prevail in our fraternal organizations as a mere 'monkey-doodle' work, inasmuch as this work cultivates decorum†) and aims to exemplify certain useful lessons,‡) nevertheless it is proper to insist that such ritual work is merely incidental to the higher ends of the organization; and *while a certain class of members are attracted by the ritual work, it is a question whether they are, after all, of the quality that a really strong and dignified organization should seek.*§) The Knights of Columbus, like all other fraternal organizations, will be judged by its good works rather than by the professions of its ritual or its financial statements."

---

*) Quoted in the Catholic Citizen, of Milwaukee, Vol. xxxiv, No. 26.

†) "Risum teneatis, amici?" In St. Charles, Mo., recently, after an initiation, the hall wherein it had taken place, looked like a battlefield after a barbaric fray.

‡) Which could be "exemplified" as well, and better, by more Catholic means.

§) Italics ours.—A. P.

We trust this glimmering of an important truth, so often emphasized in THE REVIEW, will prove the beginning of better things. If the Knights of Columbus will do away with their "ritual" altogether and abolish all "secret features," they may perhaps hope some day to become a society that will appeal to sensible and orthodox Catholic men, instead of being obliged to recruit their membership from that "certain class of members" concerning whom the *Citizen* intimates that they are not "of the quality that a really strong and dignified organization should seek."

In opposing the K. of C. we are not, as has frequently been charged, animated by a desire to destroy this society; we only wish that it may be converted and live.

* * *

IS THE SINGLE TAX THEORY AN OPEN QUESTION?

VI.

THE ARGUMENTS OF HENRY GEORGE EXAMINED.

Thus far we have been engaged in ascertaining the relation of the Henry George theory to the teaching of Pope Leo XIII. in his encyclical Rerum Novarum. We have established their diametric opposition and utter incompatibility. By this the question placed at the head of the present series of articles is definitively solved for every loyal Catholic. What the Pope as teacher of the Universal Church teaches or rejects, every true Catholic will likewise admit or reject.

The question of private property, and in particular of landed property, is not merely touched upon or mentioned incidentally in the encyclical, which is addressed to the whole Catholic world. "In the present letter," writes the Pope, "the responsibility of the Apostolic office urges us to treat the whole question [regarding the condition of the working classes] of set purpose and in detail, in order that no misapprehension may exist as to the principles which truth and justice dictate for its settlement."

Moreover, the question of private property occupies in the entire social problem not a subordinate or unimportant position, but is in reality, as everybody will readily grant, and as the Pope expressly declares it to be, the primary and most fundamental of all the particular questions involved.

Hence, if the Pope says, in the beginning of the second part of his letter, where he treats of the remedy for social evils: "We approach the subject with confidence and in the exercise of the rights which manifestly belong to us, for no practical solution of this question will be found apart from the intervention of religion

and of the Church. It is We who are the chief guardian of religion and the chief dispenser of what pertains to the Church, and We must not by silence neglect the duty incumbent on us"—the same authority, and even much more, attaches to the closing sentence of the first part: "The first and most fundamental principle, therefore, if we wish to alleviate the miserable condition of the masses, must be the inviolability of private property." Hence Leo's teaching is the teaching of the Church, which every Catholic is bound to embrace. Accordingly the Single Tax theory for us can not be considered on open question.

We now turn to the arguments advanced by Henry George, the ablest exponent of the theory. At the time when he was most active in bringing his views before the people, at home and abroad, there appeared many able essays and printed lectures refuting his assertions and meeting his objections. Before us lies a little volume entitled: 'The Champions of Agrarian Socialism. A Refutation of Emile de Laveleye and Henry George, by Rev. Victor Cathrein, S. J.' (Buffalo, N. Y., Peter Paul and Bro., 1889.) The preface begins thus: "The present treatise is a refutation of Agrarian Socialism from an historical politico-economical, and ethical standpoint. In it two series of articles by the Rev. Victor Cathrein, S. J., a translation of which appeared in the New York *Freeman's Journal* from February 18th to April 28th, 1888, are blended together."

In his 'Primitive Property' (Paris, 1877, English edition, 1878) Emile de Laveleye, professor of political economy in the University of Liège, had attacked private land ownership particularly from the historic point of view. He endeavored "to prove that everywhere and in all nations only collective possession of land (communal property) existed in primitive times, and that individual ownership was developed rather late and only by degrees. This development, he says, was brought about mostly through cunning and deceit, till at length collective possession was almost entirely done away with" (Cathrein, p. 11.)

Henry George makes the views of M. de Laveleye his own. "Historically, as ethically," he writes, "private property in land is robbery. It nowhere springs from contract; it can nowhere be traced to perceptions of justice or expediency; it has everywhere had its birth in war and conquest, and in the selfish use which the cunning have made of superstition and law."...." 'In all primitive societies,' says M. de Laveleye, as the result of an investigation which leaves no part of the world unexplored—'in all primitive societies, the soil was the joint property of the tribes and was subject to periodical distribution among the families, so that all might live by their labor as nature has ordained'....If M.

de Laveleye be right in this conclusion, and that he is right there can be no doubt [!], how, it will be asked, has the reduction of land to private ownership become so general?" (Progress and Poverty, bk. vii, ch. iv, pp. 266-268.)

Father Cathrein refutes M. de Laveleye's assertions in two chapters, one of which treats of property-holding among the Russians and ancient Teutons, the other of that among the most ancient Oriental nations. (Cathrein, pp. 21-76.)

In another chapter the learned Jesuit exposes the fallacies contained in the arguments which Henry George has taken from political economy "to show that private property in land necessarily leads to the impoverishment of the great bulk of mankind." (Ibid. pp. 84-96.) It would lead us too far to enter upon the field of history or of political economy, and we must, accordingly, refer the reader to the respective chapters in Cathrein's volume or to similar treatises.

In his Open Letter Mr. George says that the reform he proposes, "like all true reforms, has both an ethical and an economic side," and he thinks that "the ethical is the more important side." In Progress and Poverty he likewise lays greater stress on the justice than on the expediency of his proposals (Bk. vii, ch. i, p. 239.)

Why, therefore, does Henry George, from the standpoint of ethics, reject individual land ownership as unjust? His chief or rather only argument is thus proposed in Progress and Poverty:

"What constitutes the right basis of property? What is it that enables a man to justly say of a thing, 'It is mine!' From what springs the sentiment which acknowledges his exclusive right as against all the world? Is it not, primarily, the right of a man to himself, to the use of his own powers, to the enjoyment of the fruits of his own exertions?.... As a man belongs to himself, so his labor when put in concrete form belongs to him.

"And for this reason, that which a man makes or produces is his own, as against all the world—to enjoy or to destroy, to use, to exchange, or to give. No one else can rightfully claim it, and his exclusive right to it involves no wrong to any one else. Thus there is to everything produced by human exertion a clear and indisputable title to exclusive possession and enjoyment, which is perfectly consistent with justice, as it descends from the original producer, in whom it is vested by natural law. The pen with which I am writing is justly mine. No other human being can rightfully lay claim to it, for in me is the title of the producers who made it. It has become mine, because transferred to me by the stationer, to whom it was transferred by the importer, who obtained the exclusive right to it by transfer from the manufacturer,

in whom, by the same process of purchase, vested the rights of those who dug the material out of the ground and shaped it into a pen. Thus my exclusive right of ownership in the pen springs from the natural right of the individual to the use of his own faculties.

"Now, this is not only the original source from which all ideas of exclusive ownership arise.....but it is necessarily the only source. There can be to the ownership of anything no rightful title which is not derived from the title of the producer and does not rest upon the natural right of the man to himself. There can be no other rightful title, because (1st.) there is no other natural right from which any other title can be derived, and (2d.) because the recognition of any other title is inconsistent with and destructive of this...." (Progress and Poverty, bk. vii, ch. i, p. 240.)

In this form the argument is ably and completely answered by Father Cathrein. He first sums it up in the following syllogism: "A single individual can call *only* that his own which is the produce of his labor; now, the soil is not the produce of his labor; hence he can not call the soil his own." He denies the major proposition and proves that "labor is neither the original nor the exclusive source of proprietorship" (Cathrein, pp. 100 sq.)

Mr. George advances the same argument in his Open Letter to the Pope as follows:

"As to the right of ownership we hold: That—

"Being created individuals, with individual wants and powers, men are individually entitled (subject of course to the moral obligations that arise from such relations as that of the family) to the use of their own powers and the enjoyment of the results.

"There thus arises, anterior to human law, and deriving its validity from the law of God, a right of private ownership in things produced by labor—a right that the possessor may transfer, but of which to deprive him without his will would be theft.

"This right of property, originating in the right of the individual to himself, is the only full and complete right of property. It attaches to things produced by labor, but can not attach to things created by God.

"Thus, if a man take a fish from the ocean he acquires a right of property in that fish, which exclusive right he may transfer by sale or by gift. But he can not obtain a similar right of property in the ocean, so that he may sell *it* or give *it* or forbid others to use *it*."

The reader will have noticed that this reasoning is the very same as that quoted above from Progress and Poverty. The answer to the argument is obvious and is suggested by the very examples by which Henry George illustrates his theory. Of

course, no sane man who admits individual land ownership, claims or defends the right of property in the ocean or the atmosphere or the sun, although "to men," i. e., to Mr. George and his followers, ocean, air, sunshine, and soil, are all "involved in the single term land"! Need we remind our readers of the fact that the ocean, the atmosphere, and the sun, just as the moon and the milky way and the whole firmament, are physically incapable of being taken possession of or appropriated either by an individual man or even by the whole of mankind?

Our answer, then, to Mr. George's argument is obvious and brief: his theory is self-contradictory and does away with all property, not only in the soil, but in everything else.

If a Henry George man rows out into the ocean and is so lucky as to "take from the ocean" a fine fish, he can not call it "his," he does not "acquire a right of property in that fish," for the simple reason that he did not produce it! All fishes, whether living in the ocean, or in rivers or lakes, belong to the "things created by God," not to the "things produced by labor"; but the right of property, Mr. George has just assured us, "can not attach to things created by God." Again, if he would go hunting and kill a hare or a duck or a grizzly bear, he could not own it, for the same simple reason that he did not produce it. And if the whole population of the United States, individually or in a body, would go fishing or hunting, the same would hold as to what they would catch; for "the right of property can not attach to things created by God." Nor can a Henry George man own the pen with which he writes, just as Mr. George himself did not and could not own the pen he was writing with. How so? Because the title by which he held it, was essentially vitiated. Mr. George says, he bought the pen from the stationer. True, but the stationer could not sell it, since he did not own it! He had purchased it from another who could not sell it, viz., the importer! The importer, indeed, had got it from the manufacturer; but the manufacturer himself could not dispose of it, since he did not own it; for he in his turn had got it from men who had no right to give it to him, viz., "those who dug the material out of the ground and shaped it into a pen"! Here lies the radical crux that invalidates all further transactions.

All raw material belongs not to the things produced by labor, but to the things created by God. Hence, according to the George theory, no right of property can attach to the material dug out of the ground, no more than to the fish taken from the ocean. Those, therefore, who dug the material out of the ground and shaped it into a pen, handled what was not their own. But no handling or shaping of what is not your own can make it your own, if "making

or producing" is the original and only title of ownership. First you must own or acquire as your own the material you wish to work upon, and then only will what you make of it by your exertion, become really and truly yours—your property.

What we have said of the pen, holds good of all other material objects. Each and every one of them consists of some material which comes ultimately from nature and is a thing created by God. Hence it is plain that the Henry George theory of ownership is suicidal and destructive of all proprietorship, in movables as well as immovables.

(*To be continued.*)

MINOR TOPICS.

Suicide Statistics.—Mr. George P. Upton, for many years associate editor of the Chicago *Tribune*, and an authority as to statistics bearing upon suicide, lynching, and other subjects of pressing public importance, for which there are no official records, publishes in the *Independent* (No. 2888) "the facts about suicide." These facts are indeed startling. During the last thirteen years 77,617 cases of suicide have been reported in the newspapers of this country. The following table shows the total number per annum, as well as the increase from 1891 to 1897, the curious decrease in 1898 and 1899, and again the increase from 1899 to 1904, which almost duplicates that from 1891 to 1897:

1891	3,531	1898	5,920
1892	3,860	1899	5,340
1893	4,436	1900	6,755
1894	4,912	1901	7,245
1895	5,759	1902	8,132
1896	6,530	1903	8,597
1897	6,600		
Total			77,617

The increase in cities has already been noted by Mr. Frederick L. Hoffman, the life insurance statistician. It proportionally tallies with the general increase all over the country. In 1902 there were 2,500 cases of suicide reported in fifty cities in this country. In these cities the number has about doubled in ten years. Suicides are more common among men than women in all countries. Of the 77,617 persons tabled above, 57,317 were men and 20,300 women. Between the ages of ten to twenty-five suicides of women are more numerous than those of men between the same ages. It is one of the saddest features of the case that suicides of women are increasing faster than those of men. Half a century ago five times as many men committed suicide as women. A quarter of a century ago the proportion was three men to one woman. During the last three years the ratio has been about 2½ to 1.

Another sad feature of the suicide situation according to Mr. Upton, is the increasing number of children who kill themselves, but he gives no figures on this head.

Another singular feature is the comparatively large number of physicians who kill themselves each year—large, that is, as compared with members of other professions. In the last thirteen years 535 physicians in the United States have committed suicide—an average of about 41 each year—as compared with 89 clergymen and 61 attorneys, only those enjoying some prominence being taken into account.

The agencies for self-murder are numerous, but 61,933 of the 77,617 victims have killed themselves either by poison or the revolver. Prior to 1894 the larger number shot themselves, but since that year poison has headed the list. It may be boldly affirmed that the steady increase in the use of poison is due to the ease with which carbolic acid can be obtained. More persons kill themselves with it than with all other kinds of poison combined. It is cheap—within the reach of every one; and it is certain in its effect. 2,976 ended life by hanging, 6,091 by drowning, 4,447 by the knife, 809 by throwing themselves in front of locomotives, 763 by jumping from roofs and windows, 294 by fire, 77 by dynamite, and 227 in miscellaneous ways.

These are the gruesome facts. "They show," says Mr. Upton, "that suicide is rapidly increasing; that the value of human life is, comparatively, decreasing. The ethics of suicide have greatly changed. The question—Has any one the right to end his life when he has no further use for it or is dissatisfied with it?—is rarely asked now. In the old days a jury in a suicide case usually declared the victim *non compos*. Such verdicts now are rare. It is assumed that a person may have a sufficient motive for suicide and may be entirely sane when he takes his life. In the old days, also, the Church treated suicide victims much as it did murderers, and not only condemned them to eternal punishment, but to earthly ignominy by refusing them Christian burial; but, with the increased weakening of ecclesiastical authority and a growing doubt of eternal punishment and, sometimes, uncertainty as to the definite nature of the hereafter, this restraint has largely disappeared."

German Catholics of Missouri Against Divorce.—At its recent convention in Jefferson City the German Catholic State Union of Missouri went out of the beaten path by passing a strong resolution against the growing divorce evil. We reproduce the same in full:

"Marriage is infinitely more than a civil contract, and the contrary doctrine we denounce as false, illogical, and degrading. We hold that the sacred bond that unites husband and wife in marriage can not be broken and is not dissolved 'until death do them part.'

"We deplore as a national disgrace the prevalent divorce evil, that has fixed upon our country the infamous distinction of being among all civilized nations of the globe the most reckless disturber of the marriage tie, the most frivolous destroyer of homes. We believe that modern history holds forth no record of any moral calamity greater than has befallen our country in consequence of

the loss of right principles and the resultant moral corruption, horrifying both in character and extent, which is traceable to the terrible laxity of the several States in exercising an alleged power, by so-called absolute divorce to dissolve the bond of marriage;—a bond which we hold the State can not and does not create, which is beyond its control, and which therefore it can not destroy. Against this shameless condition we raise our voice in earnest and solemn protest.

"At the same time we are gratified to know that the evils of divorce are becoming recognized more and more. We note with satisfaction that there is now and has been for some time past, a great outcry all over our country against this moral plague of divorce, and we hope that this opposition will swell to overwhelming proportions, so as to assure the stamping out of the evil. Believing as we do that there is but one efficient remedy for the evil, we heartily welcome every approach to the Catholic ideal of marriage, the only true view, that 'man may not put asunder what God hath joined together.'*)

"As citizens of Missouri we regret that the law of our State contains most loose principles upon the subject of marriage and so-called divorce. We therefore, out of a sense of decency and out of a sense of right, and as citizens of our beloved commonwealth of Missouri, having the welfare of our State at heart, are justified in demanding, and we do hereby demand:

"1. The abolishment of the sanction of law now given to that certain form of concubinage known as the 'common-law marriage.' This so-called marriage is without excuse in a civilized and well-regulated community, and to entitle the parties to such concubinage to bear the sacred names of husband and wife, is an insult to respectable members of the community. Every such so-called marriage shall by law be held to be null and void.

"2. We demand the repeal of the divorce law of Missouri, for the reasons among others herein above enumerated, and we respectfully urge the legislature to recognize, defend, and act upon the great moral principle that a true marriage never is and never can be disrupted by law. It will be a glorious day indeed when the great commonwealth of Missouri follows the illustrious example of South Carolina in this particular regard.

"In those few serious causes that may require the separation of the married, whether temporary only or otherwise, the law ought to provide for a judicial separation, or separation from bed and board, to protect the children, to enforce maintenance and other personal and property rights and duties, and neither necessity nor a sound public policy requires more."

Free Parochial Schools.—This is the way the rector of a Catholic congregation in Rochester, N. Y., who, like so many of his brethren in various parts of the country, saw the necessity of providing a Catholic free school, accomplished his purpose. Under the title: "1000 Members Wanted," he distributed among his parishioners the following circular:

"The time has come to turn our parish school into a free school,

*) It is characteristic that the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, in publishing, in its edition of Sunday, May 15th, what purported to be the text of this resolution, cut out the above paragraph "At the same time..... joined together."

by doing away with the payment of the 'school money.' This may easily be accomplished, if every adult member of this parish will volunteer to offer once every Sunday, instead of the customary cent, at least a nickel. The existence and proper maintenance of its school is of paramount necessity for this congregation and its future well-being. For this purpose let us form a 'Parochial Free School Society,' of which you may become a charter member by detaching the annexed slip and returning the same next Sunday, signed with your full name and residence, beginning at the same time to drop your nickel. The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass will be offered once every month for all living and departed members of the Society, and the school-children will, in their morning and afternoon sessions, offer a short prayer for their benefactors. In due time a complete list of the members of the society will be published, and every member supplied with a souvenir."

The annexed slip read thus:

"I, the undersigned, do hereby declare my willingness to become a member of the 'Parochial Free School Society,' of St. —— Church, for the support of the parish school, and as such pledge myself, upon my word of honor, to drop once every Sunday, as long as I remain a member of this parish, at least 5 cents in the collector's basket."

The reverend rector assures us that "the scheme worked to perfection."

We are informed by Mr. Joseph F. Kuehne that the school of Our Savior's church in Jacksonville, Ill., has been free to all the children of the parish for sixteen years, and that two years ago it was supplemented by a free high school.

We are requested to note that the Society of the Holy Spirit, which we believe we have already on a previous occasion, several years ago, recommended to our readers, has among its various objects that of "aiding priests in poor country missions, and of establishing, in such localities, free Catholic schools." The Society has its headquarters in New Orleans (516 Natchez Street). During its twenty years of life, we are informed by a recent circular, it has paid out for various good purposes over one hundred thousand dollars, besides distributing between two and three million Catholic books, tracts, etc. The membership fee for men is $5 per annum; for women, $3.

Doctors on Vaccination.—*Medical Talk*, a magazine published by Dr. C. S. Carr at Columbus, O., is conducting a campaign of enquiry as to what doctors think of vaccination. The editor takes Polk's Medical Directory and writes to the doctors in alphabetical order. Many do not bother to answer a letter, but out of a hundred replies, forty-eight believe that vaccination does prevent smallpox. All the rest disbelieve in the efficacy of vaccination. Of those who believe that vaccination prevents smallpox, some are sure that vaccination only lasts one year. Others believe that it lasts three years; others five years; others seven years; and nine, out of the one hundred, believe that a successful vaccination lasts a life-time. Thirty-one, out of one hundred, believe that variolinum is just as effective as vaccination. (Variolinum is a perfectly harmless homœpathic remedy which is swallowed as a

preventive of smallpox.) Sixty-three, out of the one hundred, believe that vaccination should not be made compulsory. Only thirty-four expressed themselves as in favor of closing the schools to unvaccinated children.

Fifty-three state positively that they believe vaccination is dangerous. (*Medical Talk*, v, 5.)

Very few of these physicians are willing to allow their names to be published in connection with their answers, because physicians, as a rule, are afraid to come out against vaccination. They know that it will hurt their standing with the political doctors who control the boards of health and are dictators of the more important medical societies.

The Commission for the Codification of Canon Law is now in working order, and much interest attaches to the spirit in which they will carry out their great undertaking. The Rome correspondent of the *Freeman's Journal* (No. 3698) has it on good authority that the new code will be extremely important from one point of view. "The laws it contains will be comparatively few, as compared with the present mass of legislation; they will be very clear and simple; they will introduce uniformity on many vital points, such as the celebration of the sacrament of matrimony; they will apply to all the faithful in every country, leaving room for as few exceptions and privileges as possible; and finally the new code will tend to extend the powers of bishops and national councils. It is likely to inaugurate the de-centralization which was predicted.... many months since. At present the Roman Congregations are obliged to deal with a great deal of work which might as well be transacted by some central authority in each of the different countries concerned. It was the intention of Pius X. to create this central authority by the establishment of primates, but so many difficulties have been raised to this that the project may have to be deferred for a time. Meanwhile, however, it seems most probable that Apostolic delegates will be sent to all countries in which the Holy See is not at present directly represented, and these delegates will be charged with the task of seeing that the general law of the Church as contained in the new code is strictly observed."

——It is to be hoped that the recent expression of the decisive majority of the central council of teachers in the Chicago public schools, in favor of the right and power to administer corporal punishment to unmanageable pupils, and their determination to recommend it to the management committee, will lead to a change in public sentiment.

Says the Chicago *Chronicle* (April 9th): "'Spare the rod and spoil the child' was once regarded as a mere truism, and any purpose to discuss it seriously as regards its sound sense would have been regarded as both surprising and absurd. Somebody began a crusade against corporal punishment in toto, and one result has been the almost total disappearance from society of the principle of authority. There is no disposition anywhere to favor punishments which are excessive or violent or what the sentimentalists call brutal, but it is a manifest truth that every human society, from the family circle up to the vastest empire, must be governed. Among men government may be partially and temp-

orarily substituted by reason or persuasion, which latter is a modified form of bribery, but never for long. The substitution, moreover, overtaxes reason and love and the moral sentiments, which have their own offices to fill in this life.....Government, absolutely necessary in schools as elsewhere, is impossible unless grounded in the last resort on force."

——New York City has just witnessed the close of a singular conference—the "Bible League Convention"—the professed object of which was "protection of the Bible against its advanced students." Protestant preachers and laymen from all parts of the country protested against "assaults" on the Bible; that is, the publication of conclusions reached by many of the "higher critics" in this country and Europe. The N. Y. *Evening Post* (May 9th) thinks this conference has done more than any of the higher critics to shake the faith of men in the Bible as an infallible and inerrant revelation; for, as Dr. Parkhurst put it, the addresses "left upon the minds of a good many sincere people the idea that there is a great amount of incompatibility between scholarship and Scripture; that there be certain things about the Bible which, if known, would be embarrassing to the faith; and that turning too much of that searchlight of investigation upon the foundations of Scripture would shake confidence in the stability of the foundations." One of the Bible defenders dwelt upon the "unparalleled danger" of the present attacks. Soon we shall see all the preachers, and Protestantism itself, relinquish the Bible, and there will be only one defender of its divine character and inspiration left—the Catholic Church, which has always been its faithful custodian and authorized exponent.

——We read in the Baltimore *Sun* of May 10th:

"Services in memory of their departed brethren were held last night by Washington Council, No. 224, Knights of Columbus. In the center of the hall was placed a table, upon which were 15 lighted candles. Around the table were vacant chairs, which were draped in mourning. The lighted candles represented former members of the council, and as the roll was called and the name of one of the deceased brothers was reached, the candle would be extinguished. The services were attended by members of the council and a number of invited guests. Addresses were delivered by Rev. Dr. E. T. Shannon [Shanahan?] Vice-Rector of the Catholic University; Rev. P. J. O'Connell, Hon. J. S. Smith, and Grand Knight Dr. Wilson P. Malone."

We have read of similar "memorial services" for departed "Elks." They must be very touching, and, as they were in this instance participated in by a professor of the Catholic University, they are no doubt entirely unobjectionable and thoroughly appropriate. For ourselves, "old fogies" as we are, we prefer the practice of "old-fashioned" Catholic societies who cause the holy sacrifice of the Mass to be offered up for their departed members and attend this most sublime and Catholic function in a body.

——The editor of the N. Y. *Sun*, who is an adept at constructing definitions, was asked the other day to define that much over-

worked word "strenuous." This is the way he acquitted himself of the task:

"Derived from a Greek word meaning strong, hard, rough, harsh, 'strenuous' is defined by Webster and other authorities variously as signifying: urgent, eagerly pressing, ardent, bold, strong, active, pushing. As applied to speech it has come in recent times to be associated with something akin to boastfulness or blatancy; in variation of the significance attached to the word by Keats, who speaks of

'Him whose strenuous tongue
Can crush joy's grape against his palate fine.'

"By a curious process of degeneration, to which words are sometimes subject, a strenuous man has come to mean to-day not necessarily a strong man, but rather one who strains somewhat over-eagerly to appear strong."

——The reliable Rome correspondent of the New York *Freeman's Journal* (No. 3699) sends his paper the following very significant item of news:

"For some time past the Holy See has been gravely concerned about many of the secret societies which exist in the United States. A couple of months ago an American priest worked very hard to secure from the ecclesiastical authorities here a letter expressing approval of one of these societies, the membership of which is open both to Catholics and non-Catholics. After the most careful enquiries were made, the approval was formally refused. Quite recently information has reached Rome of the attitude of many American bishops towards certain Catholic societies. It is admitted that they undoubtedly do some good, but the bishops whose views are now before the Holy See are firmly convinced that they do much more harm; that they are likely to be a source of danger to the Church in the future, and that they tend to break up the family life of Catholic homes."

——The Cleveland *Catholic Universe* (No. 1542), which, unlike our Homeric *Church Progress*, discusses the question of a Catholic daily newspaper press on its merits, arrives at this conclusion: "It would require at least $100,000 capital to start a Catholic daily. Much more than money, of course, would be necessary for its success. One of the chief difficulties in the way of the project is the indifference of the Catholic people themselves. If the Catholic public could be pledged to support a Catholic daily, there would be no doubt about its prospering."

That is indeed the crux of the matter. But it seems to us that, outside of the divinely appointed authorities of the Church, no other agency could do so much as the Catholic weekly press to change the present indifference of the Catholic people into an ardent and active enthusiasm. Let's take a long pull and a strong pull together, brethren!

——In the Wichita *Catholic Advance* of May 7th we read:

"The residence of the Apostolic Delegate at Washington is not suitable for his purpose. It has been decided to build an appropriate residence and each diocese will be taxed according to its population to supply the requisite funds. We hope the committee

in charge will keep in mind the wealth of the diocese as well as its population."

His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate informs THE REVIEW that there is this much truth in the report: "that the most reverend archbishops on the occasion of their last meeting took into consideration the advisability of providing the Delegation with a more suitable residence, and appointed a committee to look into the matter."

——"We do not usually encumber our columns with 'fashion notes,' but we set aside our usual rule this once to remark that, according to high fashionable authority, 'brides this spring will carry beautiful prayer-books, instead of the conventional shower bouquet.' Those interested will please make a note of this."—San Antonio *Southern Messenger* (xiii, 10).

We might have patience with *such* "fashion notes" in Catholic newspapers; but the stuff which is printed from week to week under this heading in several otherwise respectable contemporaries, is not only silly and nauseating, but at times actually subversive of womanly modesty and public decency. The "fashion page" is a feature of modern journalism which the Catholic press might well leave to the secular dailies and the monthly women's magazines. At best it tends to cultivate vanity and prodigality.

——Commenting on the project of a Catholic Congress to be held here in St. Louis as one of the features of the World's Fair, the Cleveland *Catholic Universe* (No. 1545) says: "Every loyal Catholic would welcome a Catholic congress if it promised to accomplish anything. By not attempting too much, by not spending all its energy in talk, by not satisfying itself with florid resolutions, and by doing something, a gathering of Catholics at St. Louis would be a boon. But let us see more than grandiloquent premisses. Who has undertaken to stand sponsor for the project? Where is the organized plan of action? So far the whole idea seems to be as vague as a dream."

——Concerning the Elks (see our No. 15, p. 240), His Lordship the Bishop of Denver, under date of April 29th, informs us as follows:

"Dear Mr. Preuss: In reply to your letter of the 25th inst., I wish to state that I have never had occasion to take any action with a view to prohibit Catholics of this Diocese from joining the society of the Elks, and if any difficulty regarding this question should arise in future, I propose to follow the prescriptions contained in the III. Plenary Council of Baltimore, especially what is found in N. 255. With kind wishes I remain, Yours sincerely in Christ, † N. C. Matz, Bishop of Denver."

——One of our reverend subscribers begs us to note in THE REVIEW that he is in need of a good organist. He would prefer a gentleman for the position. Address: St. Joseph's Church, Leavenworth, Kansas.